REMARKS

In view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the patent application identified above and withdraw the present rejection. Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application, all of which stand currently rejected.

35 U.S.C. §112:

The Examiner rejected Claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, regarding enablement. The Examiner mentioned the term "limit element." Specifically, Claims 9-11 recite "a limit element limiting the extent of travel for the second actuator". Claims 10-11 also recite "wherein the limit element resists relative rotation between the inner shaft member and the tubular outer sheath."

However, one of many possible embodiments of a particular type of "limit element" is shown in Figures 1-6 of the original application, and is described as "a longitudinal slot 36 defining a channel for sliding the moveable actuator 24 and limiting the extent of possible travel for the actuator 24 and proximal hub assembly 22". (Page 8, lines 2-4). Because the slot constrains the actuator, longitudinal travel is resisted, as well as rotation of the outer sheath around the inner shaft is resisted. This kind of actuator-in-a-slot is but one embodiment of the "limit element" of Claims 9-11, and is supported by the original disclosure as filed.

35 U.S.C. §102:

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) on the basis of Gunderson (U.S. 5,776,142). The Examiner stated that Gunderson shows:

> an inner shaft (40); an outer shaft (50); a medical device (labeled in column 4, lines 29-35) is within the outer sheath (50); wherein a handle (20, 30) is coupled with the inner shaft (40) and the outer sheath (50); and wherein the handle has a first and second independently moveable actuator (24, 34, column 4, lines 52-67 and column 5, lines 1-16) for adjusting the positions of the inner shaft and the outer sheath. Furthermore, the first and

> second actuators (24, 34) provide a different amount of mechanical advantage (column 8, lines 36-60).

(Office Action, pp. 2-3)

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the present invention, as recited in the Claims. For example, Claim 1 includes the following limitations, among others:

> *a first and second independently moveable actuator for adjusting the relative longitudinal positions of the inner shaft and the outer sheath*, each of the first and second actuators providing a *different amount of mechanical advantage* between an input to one of the first and second actuators by a physician and a resulting relative longitudinal position of the inner shaft and the outer sheath respectively.

However, among other limitations, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention, including "a first and second independently moveable actuator for adjusting the relative longitudinal positions of the inner shaft and outer sheath".

For example, the release wire actuators 24 and 34 described in the Gunderson reference do not adjust the position of either the inner sheath 40 or the outer sheath 50. Rather, they "release the sutures holding the end 72 [of the stent 70] in place on the inner sheath 40." (Column 8, lines 14-18).

In other words, neither of the release wire actuators 24 and 34 disclosed in the Gunderson reference is an "actuator for adjusting the relative longitudinal positions of the inner shaft and the outer sheath", as is recited in the claims of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to allow the present invention.

Respectfully submitted,
Attorney for Applicants

By: _____
Michael W. Montgomery
Reg. No. 35,958

Date: January 19, 2004

Johnson & Johnson
Law Department
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08933
(786) 313-2922